

**REMARKS**

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-17 are amended, and claims 18-20 are added. Claims 1 and 10 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

**Claim for Priority**

The Examiner has acknowledged the Applicants' claim for foreign priority.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

Claims 1-9 and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicants have amended each of claims 1-9 and 13-17 to address the issues pointed out by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts '670, in view of Roberts '346. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

**Amendments to Independent Claims 1 and 10**

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, independent claim 1 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a ground structure for a vehicle, including

a first cable extending from a body frame of the vehicle body to the engine for grounding said engine;

a plurality of other cables, at least one of which is wired to the engine through a part coupled to said engine;

wherein said first cable has a wire diameter set substantially equal to the one of the plurality of other cables wired to said engine through the part coupled to said engine, and

wherein no other one of the plurality of other cables has a wire diameter larger than the wire diameter of the first cable.

In addition, independent claim 10 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a ground structure for a vehicle, including

a first cable adapted for grounding an engine and an upper body frame to each other, the first cable extending from a body frame to the engine;

a second cable adapted for grounding a battery and the engine to each other; and

a third cable adapted for wiring an electrical component to the battery;

said first and second cables having a wire diameter set substantially equal to the wire diameter of the third cable for wiring an electrical component to at least one of the battery and the engine.

The novel features set forth in claims 1 and 10 can be seen in FIG. 3.

By contrast, as can be seen in Roberts '670 FIGS. 3 and 4, this document merely discloses a ground strap 60, with one end 64 connected to the differential 68, and the other end 70 connected to a gas tank strap 72.

In addition, Roberts '346 column 3, lines 5-29 and FIG. 4 merely disclose cable 46 connected between the negative battery terminal 18 and the engine housing; cable 50 connected between the positive battery terminal 16 and the engine starting motor; and second wire 58 branching outwardly from the positive battery cable 50 and connected at 60 to the front of the internal combustion engine 11.

Further, there is no indication in either of these references that any cable is connected to an upper body frame, or that any one of the cables has a diameter equal to a diameter of another one of the cables, as presently claimed.

For example, the Examiner insists that Roberts '670 discloses an engine having rubber mounts and a ground strap 60 connected to engine 12 and body 14 so that an electrical path is formed therebetween.

However, in Roberts '670, the ground strap 60 is connected to the engine and body indirectly. In the ground structure of the present invention, a cable is connected from the vehicle body to the engine directly.

The Examiner has not shown that either of Roberts '670 or Roberts '346 faced the problems faced by the present inventors. Nor has the Examiner shown that it would be

obvious to one skilled in the art to make the first cables as large as the largest of the other cables, as presently claimed.

As such, no combination of Roberts '670 and Roberts '346 can teach or suggest the invention as set forth in claims 1 and 10.

At least for the reasons explained above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in each of independent claims 1 and 10 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Roberts '670 and Roberts '346.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 10 are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner will note that dependent claims 2-4 are amended to place them in better form, and dependent claims 18-20 are added to set forth additional novel features of the invention. The features included in claims 18-20 can be seen in FIG. 3.

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject claims, but merely to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicants respectfully petition for a three (3) months extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application and the required fee of \$1020 is being filed concurrently herewith.


If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 205-8000.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By

  
James M. Slattery, #28,380

P. O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

  
JMS/CTT/ags

#43,368